

Answers to Questions

| # | Q. | A. |
|-----|---|---|
| 1. | Can you please confirm whether the amount range is still \$25M - \$49.99M? | The estimated cost range for this procurement is of \$19.5 million to \$24.5 million. Offerors must propose costs that they believe are realistic and reasonable for the work described herein. |
| 2. | I am doing research for a client and am trying to figure out if Solicitation #SOL-268-17-000001 has an incumbent? If so, could you provide the incumbent name and contract number? | No there is no incumbent. |
| 3. | Are there any vehicle or equipment dispositions anticipated? If so, will USAID please provide a list of them? | No, LED is a new project. |
| 4. | Would USAID please provide a one-week extension so that offerors have sufficient time to incorporate USAID's responses to the questions into their technical and cost proposals? | No, the deadline for submission of proposals remains May 8, 2017. |
| 5. | Given the Easter holiday is observed during the solicitations open period, would USAID consider extending the submission deadline? | Please see A.4 |
| 6. | Can USAID please provide an anticipated date to which responses will be posted for offerors? | All responses will be posted on or before April 25th, 2017. |
| | SECTION B | |
| 7. | RFP pp. 8, Section B.4 Price/Cost Schedule, the table give in section B.4 differs from the summary tab provided in J.1 Budget Format template, can USAID please confirm which format should be used? | The Section B.4 is revised to match summary tab provided in the J.1 Budget Format. |
| 8. | RFP pp. 9, Section B.5, Payment of Fixed Fee, states that payment of fixed fee will be proportional to the LOE provided by the contract. Would USAID consider revising this to say it will follow contractor's policies and practices? | No, fee will be liquidated in accordance with the LOE expended on the contract. |
| 9. | RFP Section B.5, Payment of Fixed Fee, on page 9 states that USAID will pay fixed fee based on Level of Effort (LOE) expended during the invoice period. Section C.4, Objective 1 on page 16 states that "The contractors can receive a premium if more than 35% of jobs created are for women on the condition that the Contractor reaches the target for total number of jobs created." Would USAID please clarify the basis for the calculation and payment of Fixed Fee on this contract? | See A.16 |
| 10. | Please provide a copy of any bilateral agreements and tax exemption or reimbursement schemes that impact 52.229-8. | Currently, no bilateral agreement exists with the Lebanese Government. Offerors must provide for payment of Taxes in their offers, and the awardee must do every effort to have all VAT expenses reimbursed to USAID. |
| 11. | Recognizing the absence of a bilateral agreement between the US and Lebanon, would USAID | Please see A.10 |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| | confirm whether Offerors should budget for the payment of VAT? | |
| | SECTION C | |
| 12. | On page 13, see footnote, the solicitation provides FAR 6.101(a) guidance regarding the offerors' naming of specific persons substantially involved in the development of the scope of work for the activity. Does this provision also apply to firms involved in the design of the scope of work? | It is up to Offerors to recognize and identify conflicts of interest and avoid them. |
| 13. | For monitoring and evaluation purposes: are "job matches" (referenced on section C.3, page 13) interchangeable with jobs created? | No. Job matches are not part of jobs created. |
| 14. | On page 15 of the solicitation, a theory of change is provided for the project. Is this TOC prescriptive for all offerors or are offerors free to develop their own TOC for this project? | Offerors are free to develop their own TOC as long as they respect the approach required for LED. |
| 15. | Should offerors consider activities for micro-enterprises in this project? | Up to offerors to decide. |
| 16. | <p>There are two references to fee in Section C of the RFP, but no specific instructions are given elsewhere in the RFP. Would USAID please provide further details on these references?</p> <p>The references are:</p> <p>a. Page 16, C4, Objective 1 "the Contractor can receive a premium if more than 35% of the jobs created are for women on the condition that the Contractor reaches the target for the total number of jobs created".</p> <p>b. Page 16, C4, Objective 1 "The Contractor will have a fee system tied to the number of jobs created".</p> | The Section C is revised to remove references to the fee. |
| 17. | RFP pp. 16, C.4 Objectives, Objective 1, states that the Contractor will have a fee system tied to the number of jobs created. Can USAID clarify that this fee system is different from the fixed fee explained in Section B.5, and relates to fee for client sales and job generation? | See A.16 |
| 18. | Under Section C.4, page 16, the RFP states "the Contractor and its business advisors may be incentivized based on the numbers of jobs created and the percentage of jobs created for women." Does this imply variable compensation for the Contractor? No variable compensation for the Contractor was described in the RFP. | Section C.4, Objective 1, page 16 has been amended. |
| 19. | Section C page 17 provides a "FTE job creation targets" table under expected results. However, section L page 97 states that "Offerors shall propose the number of jobs to be created per year disaggregated by new and continuing jobs (for base and option years). Could USAID please confirm that | It is up to the offerors to propose their FTE job targets. Only the minimums are set in Section C. |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| | the offeror is required to meet the “FTE job creation targets” table on page 17, rather than propose new ones? | |
| 20. | Section C page 18 under Component 2 Expected Results – Base Period. Would USAID please provide their own differentiation between priority business enabling environment (BEE) reforms and business enabling environment reforms and clarify if they expect LED to work on BEE issues beyond the priority reforms? | It is up to the offerors to propose their analysis of BEE reforms and proposed actions. USAID has clarified in Section C the limited expectation of BEE reform and the need of flexibility (refer to Section C). |
| 21. | Under section C.4, page 18, the RFP states that objective 2 activities can include the use of "strategic grants" to achieve results. Additionally, section H.37, page 64, provides details about project "Grants under Contract to U.S. and non-U.S. NGOs." Can the funds allocated for Grants under Contract be used for local subcontracting? | No. Grants are different from subcontracting. |
| 22. | On pages 19-20 of the solicitation, the expected results primarily outline communications activities. Can USAID please clarify whether they envision results associated with MEL activities or interventions? | USAID envisions results associated with MEL activities and leaves it up to the offerors to propose them. |
| 23. | Could USAID please define the size of small and medium enterprises (such as number of employees) for the purpose of LED? | It is at the offerors' discretion. References are cited such as the Lebanon's SME roadmap. |
| 24. | Can USAID clarify what their definition of small and medium enterprises is (in terms of employment / sales)? Can USAID clarify the target firm size under objective 1? | Please see A.15 here above. Target firm size is up to the offerors discretion and technical approach. |
| 25. | Can USAID please clarify the age range that it will use to classify youth for this activity? | As per USAID's Youth in Development Policy, youth are considered under the age of 30. |
| 26. | Could USAID please confirm preferred title: Business Advisors or Business Promotion Officers | This is up to the offerors to decide and propose. |
| | SECTION F | |
| 27. | On page 30, the solicitation describes the submission requirement for the Initial Work plan as the “first draft annual work plan”. However, on page 97 of the solicitation, it states that the Draft Work Plan should address “activities for the three year base period.” Could USAID please clarify the intended scope of the draft work plan that is to be included as part of the technical proposal? | As per Section L12 (p.99) the draft work plan to be submitted with the proposal, should briefly describe activities for 3 years. On p.30, Section F, the first annual work plan for year 1, would be submitted 60 days after contract award. |
| 28. | Section F.6.2 (p. 31) In the description of the Communication and Outreach Plan of the RFP, it states, "The plan must include the Contractor's proposed communication protocol with USAID and other stakeholders, a list of proposed communication and outreach activities, and the required resources for their implementation". Could you please clarify that the resources required | Resources needed to carry out the technical approach and their respective costs should be proposed in the cost proposal. The plan itself should detail the technical aspects and be submitted in the technical approach. |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| | should be submitted as part of the cost proposal rather than the technical proposal? | |
| 29. | On page 33, section F.6.2: Please confirm that in weeks when a monthly report is due, the monthly report may be submitted in lieu of the weekly, and the same for Quarterly/Annual reports in order to avoid duplicative reporting. | On the month when the quarterly report is due, the quarterly report replaces the monthly report. The weekly activity updates are for different uses, brief, and need to be submitted regardless of the monthly reports. |
| 30. | Under section F.7.1, page 36, the RFP states “a minimum of seven years of recent experience (within the last 15 years) related to private business, including engagement in, or facilitation of business transactions with demonstrated measurable results.” Also under section F.7.2, page 36, the RFP states “a minimum of five years of recent experience (within the last ten years) related to private business, including engagement in, or facilitation of business transactions or business consultancy”. Do these experience requirements refer to years of experience managing donor-funded private sector programs, or years of direct experience working for private sector firms, or both? | Not necessarily donor-funded. It mainly refers to experience working with private sector firms or consulting for private sector. |
| 31. | The minimum qualifications of Chief of Party/Managing Director listed on page 36 state that “In circumstances where a candidate possesses exceptional relevant experience but lacks a graduate degree, relevant post-education experience will be considered.” Will USAID also allow this statement to apply to the minimum qualifications of Deputy Chief of Party/Director of Operations and Finance? | Yes. |
| | SECTION H | |
| 32. | Would USAID please provide the most recent USAID Local Compensation Plan and/or the FSN scale for Lebanon? | The Local Compensation Guide for Lebanon is provided as an attachment J.9. |
| 33. | Please provide USAID/Lebanon’s full local compensation plan including the most recent FSN scale for compliance with AIDAR 752.7007. | See A.32 |
| 34. | Will USAID provide a local compensation plan to offerors? | See A.32 |
| 35. | Can USAID provide the maximum salary on the local compensation plan? | Please see Attachment J.9 Lebanon Local Compensation Guide provided with this amendment. |
| 36. | Section H.8.a.1 (p. 48) of the RFP states the requirement to establish salary ranges based on the market values of the position in the country of contract performance. Will offers be expected to keep the ranges within the bands of the LCP? | Yes offers are expected to keep the ranges within the bands of the LCP. |
| 37. | On H.8(a), pages 48-49 the rate increase is “to be determined.” Is the rate the same as shown in H.8 (d) which is 4%, or is it different? | Direct compensation of the Contractor’s personnel will be in accordance with AIDAR 752.7007. |
| 38. | Sections H.8(d) of the RFP limits offerors to annual | See A.37 |

| | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| | <p>salary increases of no more than 4% cumulatively. This restriction may preclude offerors from complying with AIDAR 752.7007, incorporated by reference in RFP Section H.7, which states that, "Direct compensation of the Contractor's personnel will be in accordance with the Contractor's established policies, procedures, and practices, and the cost principles applicable to this contract." Specifying the annual salary increase offerors can provide their staff may result in offerors deviating from AIDAR 752.7007. Would USAID revise the annual salary increase percentage to state "to be determined," thereby allowing offerors to submit cost proposals in accordance with their established policies, procedures, and practices?</p> | |
| 39. | <p>Section H.8(d) states, "Annual salary increase (of any kind -- cost of living, merit, promotion increase, or any other type) of not more than 4% cumulatively may be granted after the employee's completion of each twelve-month period of satisfactory services under the contract." Specifying the maximum amount for annual salary increases may result in offerors deviating from AIDAR 752.7007. We respectfully request that USAID remove the restriction of a not more than 4% annual salary increase, thereby allowing offerors to submit cost proposals in accordance with their established policies, procedures, and practices. This also allows offerors to comply with page 16 of the RFP, which gives the contractor the flexibility to propose a performance bonus system for LED business advisors.</p> | See A.37 |
| 40. | <p>On pages 48-50, section H.8: We respectfully request that this section be deleted and that the Contractor's policies/procedures take precedence in compliance with Section H.7. Otherwise, we request the following changes to Section H.8:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> H.8(d): Please delete "promotion" from H.8(d) as a promotion signals a change in responsibility, essentially a new job, which could come at any time and is inconsistent with "annual" increases and our understanding of USAID's justification for limitations. H.8(d): We respectfully request that the 4% annual increase be changed to 6-7% as inflation projection models are forecasting not less than 6% over the life of the project and an annual increase of less than 6% could progressively lower staff's standard of living and therefore disincentivize qualified staff . | See A.37 |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| | <p>c. H.8(e): We request that either the Pay Scale or the CO approval be deleted as requiring both is a duplicative administrative process.</p> <p>d. Section H.8(g)(2) and Section F.5: The absolute prohibition of overtime is contrary to FAR 52.222-2 wherein a contractor would be allowed to use staff in an overtime situation on a cost efficiency basis. We request that the references be deleted and FAR 52.222-2 be included.</p> | |
| 41. | <p>Section H.8 and Section L.13 require contractors to submit and adhere to salary ranges/pay scales for the professional positions. Requiring offerors to establish and adhere to salary ranges and pay scales may preclude offerors from complying with AIDAR 752.7007, incorporated in section H.7(a), which states that "Direct compensation of the Contractor's personnel will be in accordance with the Contractor's established policies, procedures, and practices, and the cost principles applicable to this contract." We respectfully request that USAID remove the requirement of salary ranges for professional staff and pay scales for consultants, thereby allowing offerors to submit cost proposals in accordance with their established policies, procedures, and practice.</p> | See A.37 |
| 42. | <p>Section H.8 (g) (2) states "for occasions when there are essential and time-sensitive tasks to be performed that cannot be accomplished during a five-day workweek, a six-day workweek is authorized only for consultants and overseas personnel." Would USAID please confirm that a six-day workweek is authorized for all STTA and independent consultants under LED?</p> | Yes, six-day workweek is authorized for all STTA and independent consultants. |
| | SECTION L | |
| 43. | <p>Section L.10.c (p. 94) the RFP requires five documents for local subcontractors. Would USAID confirm that these documents should be submitted in the Cost proposal and not the Technical proposal?</p> | Confirmed. |
| 44. | <p>Can USAID please confirm that the submission requirements for Local Organizations L.10 on page 94 are required for any Local Organization included as a subcontractor in an Offeror's proposal?</p> | L.10 on page 94 only applies to local organizations intending to prime on this solicitation and not to local organizations participating as sub-contractors. |
| 45. | <p>Can USAID please confirm that section L.10 on page 94 only applies to local organizations intending to prime on this solicitation and not to local organizations participating as sub-contractors?</p> | Confirmed. |
| 46. | <p>Section L.10 Instructions Specific to Local Organizations (page 94): do the additional information submission requirements listed in (c)</p> | See A.45 |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| | apply to local organizations that are subcontractors, or just local organizations that are prime offerors? | |
| 47. | Section L.11 (p. 95) instructs the offeror that “proposals must be written in Times New Roman Font, with no less than size 11”. It further states that “the font used in tables and charts may be adjusted as appropriate but must be no smaller than 10 point”. May offerors use a font other than Times New Roman for tables and charts? | The Offeror may use fonts other than Times New Roman in less than a 10 font size in text boxes within tables and charts as long as the text is still readable to the reviewer. |
| 48. | We kindly ask USAID to consider permitting size 9 font in text boxes, tables, and graphics. | See A.47 |
| 49. | We kindly ask USAID to consider permitting size 9 font in text boxes, tables, and graphics. | See A.47 |
| 50. | Would USAID clarify whether the Performance in Using Small Business (SB) Concerns Narrative (pp. 99-100) is included in the 8 pages maximum of the Past Performance Information? | The Performance in Using Small Business (SB) Concerns Narrative is included into the 8 pages maximum for the Past Performance Information. |
| 51. | Section L.12 (p. 97) instructs the offerors to provide definitions to key terms used in the proposal. May offerors include these definitions in a separate un-numbered page? | Yes. Limited to one page maximum. |
| 52. | Section L.12 (p. 97) the RFP states that SOQ: (1) will clearly explain why the individual is suited for the proposed position; (2) will demonstrate that the proposed personnel possess the skills, knowledge and experience to function as proposed on the project team; (3) shall include items normally associated with CVs or resumes i.e. list of all previous employers & positions occupied and main achievements. Would USAID clarify whether a traditional CV or resume is required in addition to the Statement of Qualification (SOQ)? | Yes. Specifically indicate prior employers and positions held. |
| 53. | Would USAID please clarify whether the draft Workplan, draft MEL plan, and draft Communications and Outreach Plan are to be included in the 20 page technical proposal or may be provided as Annexes (outside of the 20-page limit)? | The draft Workplan, draft MEL plan, and draft Communications and Outreach Plan should be included within the 20 pages limit. |
| 54. | Would USAID clarify whether the Draft Staffing Plan (p. 98) must be included as a sub-section under the Management Approach or could it instead be included in a separate annex with the LOE table? | The draft staffing plan is to be included under the Management Approach. |
| 55. | Section L.13, (e)(2)(A) (p. 103): Would USAID please clarify if Biographical Data Sheets (1420s) are required for all named personnel or just Key Personnel? | Biographical Data Sheets (1420s) are required for all named personnel. |
| 56. | Section L.12(b)(3)(f)c: Communication and Outreach Plan (page 97) states that “the Branding and Marking Plan is a sub-section of the Communications and Outreach Plan that is to be submitted in the Cost Proposal.” It also appears | The Branding and Implementation Plan (BIP) and Marking (MP) must be included as part of the Cost Proposal. Communication and Outreach Plan must be included |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | listed as a cost annex under Section L.13(b) (page 101). However, page 107 states that the Branding Implementation Plan and Marking Plan must be submitted “as a separate annex to the Technical Proposal.” Could USAID please clarify under which proposal (Cost or Technical) offerors must submit these two documents as an annex? | as part of the Technical Proposal. Section L.13, page 107 is revised accordingly. |
| 57. | Section L.13, Part 11 (p. 107): Would USAID please clarify if the Branding Implementation Plan (BIP) and Marking (MP) should be included as part of the Cost Volume or with the Technical Volume as a separate annex? | See A.56 |
| 58. | Could USAID please confirm that offerors may use a version of Excel that is compatible with Excel 2010? | Confirmed. Please note, if used version other than Excel 2010, the calculations and formulas must be visible and unlocked in Excel 2010. |
| 59. | Would USAID please clarify whether the requested pay scale for Short Term Technical Assistance (consultants), found on page 49 and 107 of the RFP, is for a) one scale that covers both international and local STTA, b) covers only international STTA, or c) provides separate pay scales each for international and local STTA. | The pay scale for Short-Term Technical Assistance (Consultants) is required for both local and international STTA. It is at the offeror’s discretion to determine the best way of presenting reasonable and clear pay scale. |
| 60. | Can USAID please remove FAR Clause 52.222-41 Service Contract Labor Standards located on page 73? | Yes, FAR 52.222-41 is removed. |
| 61. | In reference to grants under contract, page 105, Section L.13e2G Grants Under Contract states that no fees will be allowed for GUC. This appears to be inconsistent with FAR 15.404-4 and ADS 302.3.6.9, which state that pre-negotiation fee objectives must be determined according to a structured approach that considers contractor effort, risk, and other special factors. Grants require significant effort to administer and carry risks for the contractor. Additionally, the statutory underpinnings of fixed fee at 10 USC 2306(d) and 41 USC 254(b) discuss fee definitions and limitations in terms of total estimated cost, which would include grants in this case. Given this, we respectfully request that USAID reconsider its agency pre-negotiation fee objective of zero percent on grants, and allow offerors to charge a fee that considers grants under contract as a part of the total estimated cost. | Fixed fee will be negotiated in accordance with FAR 15.404-4 and ADS 302.3.6.9. |
| 62. | On page 105, Cost Proposal Instructions, (G) Grants under Contract, the solicitation states that “fees will not be allowed for grants under contracts”. Most prime contractor field audit findings involve the imputation of grantee financial management failure of one kind (fraud) or another (inability to provide records in sufficient detail to reconcile expenses against advances) to the prime. This is an inherent | Please see A.61 |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | <p>risk in working with grantees in a development context and that risk should be reflected in a de minimis fee. Also, by asserting that no fees will be allowed, the complementing guarantee of an LOC for the grant funds should be offered to mitigate the cost of forward funding the grants which otherwise would be reflected in the fee. Furthermore, organizations treat GUC costs differently in their approved indirect cost structures, from pass-through no load structures to fully burdened structures. Those structures were likely designed with an ability to assess fee and therefore prohibiting fee could have varying and therefore discriminating impact across the potential offeror pool. As such, we respectfully request that the prohibition against “fee” be deleted.</p> | |
| 63. | <p>Please confirm that the GUC amounts listed on page 64, section H.37 are inclusive of applicable GUC fees.</p> | Please see A.61 |
| 64. | <p>Page 105 of the RFP states that “Fees will not be allowed for grants under contracts.” Would USAID issue a letter of credit for advance payment to grantees?</p> | Please see A.61 |
| 65. | <p>Section L.13 (e) (G) of the RFP, Page 105, states “Fee will not be allowed on grants under contracts.” We respectfully request that USAID consider allowing Offerors to propose a separate fee ceiling to be applied to the cost of grants under contract to ensure that we are able to recover the cost of capital required for implementing grants under contract.</p> | Please see A.61 |
| 66. | <p>In reference to grants under contract, Section B.4, Section L.13(e)(2)(G) state that fees will not be allowed for grants under contracts (GUC). This appears to be inconsistent with FAR 15.404-4 and ADS 302.3.6.9 that state that pre-negotiation fee objectives must be determined according to a structured approach that considers contractor effort, risk, and other special factors. Grants require significant effort to administer and carry risks for the contractor especially given that GUC are often awarded to nascent organizations that might not otherwise qualify for a direct USAID award. Given these factors and the regulatory citations, we respectfully request that USAID reconsider its agency pre-negotiation fee objective of zero percent on grants, and allow offerors to charge a fee that is reasonable and consistent with federal regulations.</p> | Please see A.61 |
| 67. | <p>With regard to L.13(e)(4), “Policies and Procedures,” on page 106 of the RFP, could USAID please confirm that offerors with prior federal</p> | All Offerors are required to submit those portions of its policies and procedures insomuch as they are needed to support rates or costs proposed in their cost |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| | contracting experience are not required to submit Policies and Procedures? | proposal. |
| 68. | Section L appears to ask the apparent successful offeror to submit an anti-trafficking certification in compliance with FAR 52.222-50, prior to award. We have interpreted the underlined part of that statement to mean that the apparent successful offeror will be required, at the time of award, to submit an anti-trafficking certification for the awarded contract. We do not interpret L.14 to mean, for example, that all offerors are to submit anti-trafficking certifications with their bids by the proposal deadline. Kindly confirm if our understanding of this L.14 requirement is correct. | Yes, your understanding is correct. The apparent successful Offeror shall submit, prior to award, a certification Regarding Trafficking In Persons Compliance Plan as per FAR 52.222-56. |
| 69. | Section L.6 (b) (2) states that "USAID will vet at [insert in the provision the applicable stage of the source selection process at which the contracting officer will notify the offeror(s) who must be vetted]." Would USAID please clarify if Partner Vetting Forms must be submitted at the proposal stage? | The Contracting Officer will notify the offeror when to submit the USAID Partner Information Form. |
| 70. | Would USAID provide offerors with the LBP-USD exchange rate to be used in the development of the cost submission? | Currently, the average USD to LBP rate is 1 USD = 1,507.5 LBP. However, this rate might be changed by the Lebanese Government at any time. Moreover, banks and other financial institutions use a higher rate when selling USD, and a lower one when buying. |
| 71. | Would USAID consider allowing for the draft work plan to be included as an Annex (RFP pp. 95, Section L.11)? This will provide sufficient space for a thorough description of the technical approach. | No. |
| 72. | Would USAID consider allowing for the MEL plan to be included as an Annex (RFP pp. 95, Section L.11)? This will provide sufficient space for a thorough description of the technical approach. | No. |
| 73. | On page 99, the solicitation calls for the past performance information to be provided for contracts that are not in CPARS. Could USAID please clarify if offerors are required to submit PPI sheets only for contracts that are included in their proposal that do not have available CPARs? | Please use PPI for submitting Past Performance information for contracts available and not available in CPAR. For contracts not available in CPAR make sure to follow instructions in the paragraph 2 under L.12(6)(a). |
| 74. | Could USAID further clarify that if a CPAR exists for a contract offerors can submit the CPAR in lieu of a PPI sheet? | Please submit PPI, USAID will do its own research in CPAR |
| 75. | Section L.12(b)(3) on page 96 states that the offeror must propose "performance standards and deliverables." Could USAID please define "performance standards?" We note that elsewhere in the RFP, the language references deliverables and indicators. | It is up to the offerors to propose. |
| 76. | The past performance information instructions in Section L.12(b)(6) (pages 99-100) request offerors provide past performance information in a list (item | Please use the Attachment J.2 for providing the Past Performance Information, along with the other requested information in Section L.12(b)(6). |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | 1), yet do not explicitly request past performance information (PPI) forms, such as the template provided in attachment J.2 in the RFP, to be completed. Could USAID please confirm that the PPI forms included in attachment J.2 are required as part of the Contractor Past Performance Information submitted with the proposal, along with the other requested information in Section L.12(b)(6) (pages 99-100)? | |
| 77. | Section L.12 (6), past performance, page 99: The RFP states "The offeror (including all partners of a joint venture if any) must provide performance information for itself, the contractor teaming arrangements, if any, and each major subcontractor (if any)..." Could USAID confirm if "contractor teaming arrangements" refers to joint ventures only or any prime/sub relationships? | Contractor teaming arrangements refers to a partnership or joint venture, or prime/sub relationship as per FAR Subpart 9.6. |
| 78. | On page 99 in section L.12(6)(a), USAID states that, "the offeror must provide performance information for itself, the contractor teaming arrangements, if any, and each major subcontractor (if any) in accordance with the following...". Can USAID please clarify what is meant by "contractor teaming arrangements"? | See A.77 |
| 79. | On page 99, USAID states that "the offeror must provide past performance for itself, the contractor teaming arrangements (if any), and each major subcontractor (if any)..." Can USAID please confirm that past performance information, including past performance information sheets, should be submitted for all sub-contractors? | Past Performance Information should be submitted for each major subcontractor (i.e. whose proposed cost exceeds 20% of the offeror's total proposed cost). |
| 80. | In the Technical Approach, (4) Personnel Qualifications and Experience, page 97 states, "This section must include a statement of qualifications and resume listing prior positions and employers (including contact information)." Would USAID confirm that the three listed references and employee biodata contact information suffice for this purpose? | No. They should be clearly listed in the CV. |
| 81. | While USAID provides job targets by year and type on page 17 of the RFP, page 97 states "Offerors shall propose the number of jobs to be created per year disaggregated by new and continuing jobs (for base and option periods)." Would USAID confirm that the Offeror is able to propose annual job creation targets, with the proviso that the total job target (new and continuing) for base years and option years would remain 1,600 and 3,400 respectively? | The targets listed on page 17 are minimum targets. Offerors shall propose their own targets considering the minimum set on page 17 by year. |
| 82. | On page 97, the solicitation requires a submission of a Draft Work Plan, Monitoring Evaluation and | No. |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| | Learning, and a Communication and Outreach Plan as part of the technical proposal and included in the 20 page limit. Given the complexity of this project, as well as the number of expected activities and indicators, would USAID consider removing the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning plan, the Draft Work Plan, and the Communication Plan from the 20-page limitation for the technical approach narrative and including them as annexes to the technical proposal which do not count towards the 20-page limit? | |
| 83. | <p>Pages 97 – 98, paragraph (4) Personnel Qualifications and Experience, request Statements of Qualifications and resumes for key personnel and technical experts. Instructions provided require bidders to include all information associated with a resume within the SOQ, including 3 references as follows:</p> <p><i>For each proposed individual, the SOQ: (1) will clearly explain why the individual is suited for the proposed position; (2) will demonstrate that the proposed personnel possess the skills, knowledge and experience to function as proposed on the project team; (3) shall include items normally associated with CVs or resumes i.e. list of all previous employers & positions occupied and main achievements. Each SOQ shall also include at least three (3) recent references (within the past seven years) including telephone numbers and email addresses for each reference.</i></p> <p>Would USAID kindly reconcile the overlap between the instructions for the SOQs and CVs, specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Would USAID allow the SOQ to replace the candidate CV given the duplication of information? In reference to the above question, if both CVs and SOQs are required, would USAID confirm that the page limits cited (3 pages for each key personnel and 2 pages for each technical expert) apply to the SOQs only? And in that case, would USAID provide a page limit for the CVs? <p>In reference to the same question, the RFP states that SOQs are exempt from the 20 page limit. Would USAID confirm that CVs are also not included in the 20 page limit, if also required?</p> | <p>SOQ and CVs (resume) are both needed. CVs are mainly to list prior positions and employers including contact information.</p> <p>Both SOQ and CV should be of 3 pages maximum for each key personnel and 2 pages for other personnel (not included in the 20 pages limit).</p> <p>It is up to the offerors not to make duplications and allocate the information within the 3 or 2 pages limit.</p> |
| 84. | Can USAID please confirm that the LOE table described on page 98 should be included as an annex to the cost proposal and not the technical proposal? | The LOE table is part of the staffing plan and so is part of the technical proposal. |
| 85. | As the statements of qualifications and resumes are not included in the 20-page limit, may we provide them as an Annex to the Technical Proposal? | Yes. With limited number of pages per candidate (as indicated in the RFP). |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 86. | Should the Draft Security Plan be submitted as an annex to the Technical Proposal or the Cost Proposal? The instructions to submit a draft security plan are in the cost proposal instructions, but it is not clearly stated under which proposal the Draft Security Plan should be submitted. | The Draft Security Plan should be submitted as an annex to the cost proposal. |
| 87. | May we include a Gantt chart for the draft work plan as an annex? | Yes. Limited to one-page Gantt chart. |
| 88. | Please confirm that full-page graphics, such as the Results Framework, are excluded from the 20-page limit. | No. They are included in the 20 page limit. |
| 89. | Per Section L, the monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) plan is included in the 20 page limit of the Technical Proposal. Given the complexity of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements and the importance of M&E in managing job creation targets, it would be beneficial for offerors to provide a detailed, thorough description of indicators and their proposed M&E approach separate from the technical approach. Would USAID consider allowing offerors to submit their MEL plans as an annex to the technical proposal, not subject to the 20-page limitation? | No. This should be within the 20 pages limit. |
| 90. | Similarly, would USAID consider allowing offerors to submit their draft work plan as an annex to the technical proposal, not subject to the 20-page limitation? | No. This should be within the 20 pages limit. |
| 91. | Would USAID consider allowing offerors to submit additional information relevant to the technical approach as annexes to the Technical Proposal? | No. |
| 92. | Would USAID confirm that the Offeror can include all associated components not explicitly included in the 20 page technical limit (e.g., SOQs, PPRs, performance using small business concerns, etc) as associated technical annexes? | Yes. But page limit for annexes must be respected. |
| 93. | While the tables F.6.2 on RFP page 32 and F.6.3 on page 35 indicates that a Security Plan should be provided to USAID within 60 days after contract award, page 104 indicates that "Offerors must submit a Draft Security Plan" and that security costs must be included in the budget and explained in the budget narrative. Would USAID please confirm if the Offeror should submit a Draft Security Plan at the proposal stage? And if we are required to submit a Draft Security Plan, that it can be presented as an Annex to the cost submission? | The offerors should submit a Draft Security Plan and it should be as an annex to the cost proposal. |
| 94. | Given the limited page space allocated for the technical response, would USAID consider including the Draft Work Plan, MEL Plan, and Communications and Outreach Plan as annexes to the technical proposal? | No. They are within the 20 pages limit. |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 95. | Referencing the above question, if the Work Plan, MEL Plan, and Communications and Outreach Plans remain within the 20 page technical limit, would USAID please clarify the level of detail expected of these plans, given the limited pages available for the required elements of the technical proposal? | They are part of the technical approach and up to the offerors discretion to decide on the level of details. |
| 96. | Section L.11(c)(1), page 95: Are the "Letters of Commitment" referenced in this section for key personnel? Or subcontractors? Should offerors provide letters of commitment for non-key personnel, resource partners, and local enterprises/firms that will be supported under LED? | Key personnel: yes. Non key personnel: yes. Subcontractors: yes. Local enterprises / firms: no. |
| 97. | Section L.12(b)(5), page 98, states that "In submitting their proposals, offerors are not allowed to enter into exclusive arrangements with local or international entities." Assuming entities refers to organizations: does this mean that local and expatriate personnel can be proposed to work exclusively with one offeror only? | The non-exclusivity applies to entities and staff. |
| 98. | Please clarify if offerors can include each of the following plans in the proposal as a separate annex: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work plan • MEL plan Communications and Outreach plan | No. They are part of the technical proposal within the 20 pages limit. |